arXiv:1603.09647v1 [math.AP] 31 Mar 2016

REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS FOR A FREE BOUNDARY PROBLEM IN TWO DIMENSIONS

MARK ALLEN

Abstract. We study the regularity of minimizers to the functional

$$J(w) = \int_\Omega a^{ij} w_i w_j + Q\chi_{\{w>0\}},$$

over a bounded domain Ω and among the class of nonnegative functions in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ with prescribed boundary data. We assume that the coefficients a^{ij} are only bounded and measurable and satisfy an ellipticity in condition. In two dimensions we prove that minimizers are Hölder continuous on subdomains. We also prove that in two dimensions a minimizer u satisfies a linear growth condition from above and below near the free boundary $\partial\{u > 0\}$.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the regularity of minimizers to a functional that gives rise to a one-phase free boundary problem. In [4], Alt and Caffarelli initiated the of study of minimizers of a functional which in its simplest form is given by

$$J_0(w) := \int_\Omega |\nabla w|^2 + \chi_{\{w>0\}}. \tag{1.1}$$

J_0 is minimized among nonnegative functions in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ with prescribed Dirichlet data. The free boundary in the above problem is $\partial\{u > 0\}$ where u is the minimizer. This free boundary problem has applications in both two dimensional flow problems as well as in heat flow problems [4]. Minimizers of (1.1) are continuous and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \{u > 0\} \\ |\nabla u| &= 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\{u > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

with the latter condition being understood in a weak sense [4, 5]. Since the initial foundational paper [4], many different generalizations of both (1.1) and the free boundary condition given above have been studied. Among the various generalizations we note that free boundary problems of the divergence form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_j(a^{ij} u_i) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \{u > 0\} \\ |\nabla u| &= 1 \quad \text{on } \partial\{u > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

have been studied. The paper [11] considered the more general two-phase problem in divergence form with the coefficients a^{ij} Lipschitz continuous. In [13] the one phase problem with lower order terms and in divergence form with the coefficients a^{ij} Hölder continuous was studied. Very recently in [9] the two phase problem in divergence form with coefficients a^{ij} only Hölder continuous was studied. For

M. Allen is supported by NSF grant DMS-1303632.

the one-phase problem one may obtain solutions by studying minimizers of the functional

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij} w_i w_j + \chi_{\{w>0\}}. \tag{1.2}$$

In the above mentioned papers [11, 13, 9], the main interest of study is geometric properties of the free boundary which in the one-phase problem is $\partial\{u > 0\}$. When a^{ij} are assumed to at least be Hölder continuous, solving the simpler problem of obtaining regularity for solutions (or minimizers of (1.2)) is rather straightforward. However, when the coefficients a^{ij} are assumed to be only bounded and measurable and satisfy an ellipticity conditiion, proving regularity of the minimizers becomes much more difficult.

In this paper we study regularity of minimizers to the following functional

$$J(w) := \int_\Omega a^{ij}(x) w_i w_j + Q(x)\chi_{\{w>0\}}\, dx, \tag{1.3}$$

subject to the condition $w = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$. We assume that $0 \leq Q(x) \leq \Lambda$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and for Λ a fixed constant. The coefficients a^{ij} are assumed to be only bounded and measurable and satisfy

$$\Lambda^{-1}|\xi|^2 \leq a^{ij}(x) \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2. \tag{1.4}$$

We also assume the symmetry condition $a^{ij} = a^{ji}$. When a^{ij} are smooth the study of (1.3) is the study of (1.1) on smooth manifolds. One may consider the study of minimizers of (1.1) over manifolds with singularities such as a cone. In that instance the a^{ij} are not continuous. In [2] the author with Chang Lara studied minimizers of (1.1) over two dimensional cones. A characterization of when the free boundary could intersect the vertex of the cone was proven and is an interesting analogue of when geodesics on a cone may intersect the vertex. To study the behavior of the free boundary on more interesting Lipschitz surfaces, it first becomes necessary to establish the regularity of minimizers to (1.3). We note that if u is a minimizer of (1.3) and $u > 0$ in some $B_r \subset \Omega$, then on B_r, u is a minimizer to

$$D(v) = \int_{B_r} a^{ij} w_i w_j. \tag{1.5}$$

Minimizers of (1.5) are in one-to-one correspondence with solutions of

$$\partial_j(a^{ij} w_i) = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Therefore, minimizers of (1.3) cannot have better regularity then solutions to (1.5). From the classical result of De Giorgi and Nash, u is Hölder continuous, but simple examples show that u is not necessarily Lipschitz. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be bounded. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3). Let $U \subset \Omega$. Then there exists $\gamma > 0$ depending on Λ and there exists $C > 0$ depending on U, Ω such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{0,\gamma}(U)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{1.7}$$

Just as continuity proofs for solutions to (1.6) when a^{ij} are Hölder continuous break down when a^{ij} are no longer continuous, previous continuity proofs for minimizers of (1.3) do not work when a^{ij} are no longer continuous. Since the functional (1.3) simplifies to (1.5) when $\sup Q \to 0$, any proof of Theorem 1.1 with estimates independent of a lower bound on Q must incorporate a proof that minimizers of

(1.5) are continuous. An outline of how we prove Theorem (1.1) is given in the beginning of Section 3.

We remark that although Hölder continuity is proven only in dimension $n = 2$, it is most likely true in higher dimensions as well. The proof we present is specific to dimension $n = 2$ and relies on a topological property of two dimensions. This property is utilized in Lemma 4.3 and is the only argument in the paper specific to two dimensions. It is not uncommon in differential equations for a continuity theorem to have a simpler argument that is specific to two dimensions. Such is the case with proving Hölder continuity for solutions to (1.6). By using Gehring's lemma one may prove that for u a solution to (1.6), $\nabla u \in L^{2+\epsilon}$ (see for instance Chapter V in [12]), and hence in two dimensions u is Hölder continuous. It is also not uncommon for a continuity theorem in differential equations to only be known for two dimensions since the argument is specific to two dimensions. Such is the case for instance for the result in [10].

In this paper we also prove two more results which are useful in studying free boundary problems. The proofs presented for these two results rely on Theorem 1.1, and are therefore proven only in dimension $n = 2$. However, aside from Theorem 1.1, all other arguments work in all dimensions. Consequently, if Theorem 1.1 is proven in dimensions $n > 2$, then the next two Theorems will also be immediately true in dimensions $n > 2$.

The following theorem shows that although a minimizer u is only Hölder continuous, u still grows linearly away from the free boundary.

Theorem 1.2. *Let dimension $n = 2$. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in B_1. Let $x_0 \in B_{1/4}$ and assume that $u(x_0) = 0$. Then there exists a constant C depending on $\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ and Λ such that*

$$|u(x)| \leq C|x - x_0| \text{ for } x \in B_{1/2}. \tag{1.8}$$

We also prove a nondegeneracy theorem. This states that a minimizer u must grow at least linearly from the free boundary. For this result we need Q bounded by below.

Theorem 1.3. *Let dimension $n = 2$. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in Ω. Assume also that $Q \geq \Lambda^{-1}$. There exists a universal constant m_0 depending on Λ such that if $x_0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$, and if $B_{2r}(x_0) \subset \Omega$, then*

$$\sup_{B_r} u \geq m_0 r.$$

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we establish a few standard preliminary results necessary to prove the main theorems. In the beginning of Section 3 we give a brief outline of how continuity of minimizers will be proven. We then prove the two main lemmas in De Giorgi's method but only from one direction. In Section 4 we restrict ourselves to two dimensions and prove the first De Giorgi lemma in the other direction. We then show this is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 5 we use Theorem 1.1 to prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we will list some results which will later be useful. Since the functional in (1.3) is not convex, minimizers are not necessarily unique. However, we have the following properties.

Proposition 2.1 (Lattice Property)**.** *Let u, v be minimizers of* (1.3) *with $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then $w_1 = \min\{u, v\}$ and $w_2 = \max\{u, v\}$ are minimizers of* (1.3) *subject to their respective boundary data.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} J(w_1) + J(w_2) &= \int_\Omega a^{ij}[(w_1)_i(w_1)_j + (w_1)_i(w_1)_j] + Q\chi_{\{w_1>0\}} + Q\chi_{\{w_2>0\}} \\ &= \int_{\{v>u\}} a^{ij}[u_iu_j + v_iv_j] + Q\chi_{\{u>0\}} + Q\chi_{\{v>0\}} \\ &\quad + \int_{\{v\leq u\}} a^{ij}[u_iu_j + v_iv_j] + Q\chi_{\{u>0\}} + Q\chi_{\{v>0\}} \\ &= \int_\Omega a^{ij}[u_iu_j + v_iv_j] + Q\chi_{\{u>0\}} + Q\chi_{\{v>0\}} \\ &= J(u) + J(v). \end{aligned}$$

Since u, v are minimizers it follows that w_1, w_2 are as well. □

As an immediate corollary we have that for fixed boundary data there exists an absolute maximum and absolute minimimum minimizer.

Corollary 2.2. *Let ϕ be such that $w = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$ with $w \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. There exists minimizers $u_{\min}, u_{\max}$ both equal to ϕ on $\partial\Omega$ such that for any minimizer v of* (1.3) *with $v = \phi$ on $\partial\Omega$,*

$$u_{\min} \leq v \leq u_{\max} \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let u be a minimizer of* (1.3) *on the unit ball B_1. There exists a constant M_0 depending only on n, Λ such that if $M \geq M_0$ and $u = M$ on ∂B_1, then*

$$u \equiv M \text{ in } B_1.$$

Proof. We consider the test function $v \equiv M$.

$$\int_{B_1} Q(x)\ dx = J(v) \geq J(u) \geq \Lambda^{-1}\int_{B_1} |\nabla u|^2 + \int_{B_1} Q\chi_{\{u>0\}}.$$

Now we consider the classical functional

$$\tilde{J}(w) = \Lambda^{-1}\int_{B_1} |\nabla w|^2 + \int_{B_1} Q\chi_{\{w>0\}}.$$

For the functional $\tilde{J}$ we use Lemma 3.2 from [4] that states that there exists a constant C depending only on n, Λ such that if $\tilde{u}$ is a minimizer of $\tilde{J}$ on B_1 and

$$\int_{\partial B_1} u \geq C,$$

then $u > 0$ in B_1. This implies that for M_0 large enough - and depending only on n, Λ - the unique minimizer of $\tilde{J}$ is $v \equiv M$. We now show that for such an M, u is also a minimizer of $\tilde{J}$, and then necessarily $u \equiv M$. We have

$$\int_{B_1} Q(x)\ dx = J(v) \geq J(u) \geq \tilde{J}(u) \geq \tilde{J}(v) = \int_{B_1} Q(x)\ dx.$$

Then all inequalities are equalities, and u is a minimizer of $\tilde{J}$, and so $u \equiv M$. □

We also have the same result for any open $U \subset B_1$.

Corollary 2.4. *Let $U \subset B_1$. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) on U. Let M_0 be as in Proposition 2.3. If $M \geq M_0$ and $u = M$ on ∂U, then*

$$u \equiv M \text{ in } U.$$

Proof. We extend u to take the values M on $B_1 \setminus U$ and label the extended function as $\overline{u}$. We also extend a^{ij} as δ_{ij} and Q as Λ on $B_1 \setminus U$. We label $\overline{J}$ as the functional on all of B_1. Since u is a minimizer of J on U we have

$$\overline{J}(M) = \Lambda|B_1 \setminus U| + J(M) \geq \Lambda|B_1 \setminus U| + J(u) = \overline{J}(u).$$

Then u is a minimizer of $\overline{J}$ on B_1, and so by Proposition 2.3 we conclude $u \equiv M$. □

We will often utilize the following scaling result whose proof is straightforward.

Proposition 2.5. *Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) on Ω. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$. We define*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{r,x_0} &:= \{y : y = (x - x_0)/r \text{ for some } x \in \Omega\} \\
u_{r,x_0}(y) &:= \frac{u(ry + x_0)}{r} \text{ for } y \in \Omega_{r,x_0} \\
Q_{r,x_0}(y) &:= Q(ry + x_0) \text{ for } y \in \Omega_{r,x_0} \\
a^{ij}_{r,x_0}(y) &:= a^{ij}(ry + x_0) \text{ for } y \in \Omega_{r,x_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then u_{r,x_0} is a minimizer of (1.3) on Ω_{r,x_0} with coefficients a^{ij}_{r,x_0} and Q_{r,x_0}.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $\kappa > 0$ be a fixed constant. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that if $R \subset B_{3/4}$ is a rectangle such that all side-lengths are less than $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, and u is a minimizer of (1.3) in R with $u \geq \kappa$ on ∂R, then $u \geq \kappa$ in all of R.*

Proof. Let $x_0 \in R$. If we wish the rescaled rectangle to satisfy $R_{r,x_0} \subset B_1$, it is only necessary that $\epsilon_0 \leq c_n r$ for a dimensional constant c_n. The rescaled function $u_{r,x_0} \geq \kappa/r$ on $\partial Q_{r,x_0}$. We choose ϵ_0 small enough such that $(\kappa/M_0) \geq (\epsilon_0/c_n)$. Then by rescaling with $r = \epsilon_0/c_n$, we have that $u_{r,x_0} \geq (\kappa/r) \geq M_0$ on $\partial Q_{r,x_0}$ with $Q_{r,x_0} \subset B_1$. From Proposition 2.1 $\min\{u_r, \kappa/r\}$ is a minimizer on Q_{r,x_0}. From Corollary 2.4 we conclude that $\min\{u_r, \kappa/r\} = \kappa/r$, so that $u \geq \kappa/r$. Rescaling back to u we conclude that $u \geq \kappa$. □

3. Lemmas of De Giorgi

Before stating the main lemmas, we give a brief outline on how continuity will be proven in this paper. To show the Hölder continuity we follow a method utilized in [6] and [1]. This method utililzes the original ideas of De Giorgi to prove Hölder continuity of solutions to (1.6). We refer the reader to [8] for an explanation of the method of De Giorgi. This method essentially involves two steps. The first step is to obtain an L^2, L^∞ bound which in our situation for (1.3) in essense states

(1) If $u < 1/2$ $(u > 1/2)$ on most of B_1, then $u \leq 3/4$ $(u \geq 1/4)$ on $B_{1/2}$.

The second lemma is an improvement that in essense states

(2) If $u < 1/2$ $(u > 1/2)$ on a small set of B_1 but which has measure bounded by below, then $u \leq 1 - \beta$ $(u \geq 1 - \beta)$ on $B_{1/2}$.

Hölder continuity is then obtained from (1) and (2) by a standard iteration technique. In our situation minimizers of (1.3) are only subsolutions to (1.6). Consequently, (1) and (2) are only obtained in one direction: we obtain a decrease in

oscillation only from above. This step comprises Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4 below. To prove these two lemmas we follow the presentation given in [8]. In Section 4 we obtain a decrease in oscillation by below. By restricting ourselves to two dimensions we are able to use a topological argument to prove (1) in the other direction which is Lemma 4.4. We then follow the method presented in [6] and [1] which shows that obtaining (1), (2) in the first direction and only (1) in the second direction is sufficient to prove the Hölder continuity.

Lemma 3.1. *Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) over B_1. There exists a constant δ depending only on n, Λ such that if*

$$\|(u - 1/2)_+\|^2_{L^2(B_1)} \leq \delta,$$

then

$$u \leq 3/4 \text{ on } B_{1/2}.$$

Proof. Throughout the proof C will be a constant depending only on n, Λ which can change throughout the proof. We utilize a sequence of cut-off functions ϕ_k satisfying

$$\phi_k \equiv 1 \text{ on } B_k \tag{3.1}$$

$$\phi_k \equiv 0 \text{ on } B^c_{k-1} \tag{3.2}$$

$$|\nabla \phi_k| \leq C 2^k. \tag{3.3}$$

In the above $B_k \to B_{1/2}$ as $k \to \infty$. We also take a sequence of level set cut-offs

$$c_k := \frac{1}{4}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^k}\right) + 1/2.$$

Since u is a minimizer on B_1 we have the following inequality

$$J(u - \epsilon\phi_k^2(u - c_k)_+) - J(u) \geq 0.$$

Notice that since $0 < \epsilon, \phi_k \leq 1$ we have

$$u - \epsilon\phi_k^2(u - c_k)_+ > 0 \text{ if and only if } u > 0,$$

so the second term in our functional J given by (1.3) does not have an effect. For the remainder of the proof we relabel $u_k := (u - c_k)_+$. Then

$$0 \leq J(u - \epsilon\phi_k^2 u_k) - J(u) = -2\epsilon \int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2 u_k)_i u_j + \epsilon^2 \int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2 u_k)_i (\phi_k^2 u_k)_j.$$

Dividing by -2ϵ and letting $\epsilon \to 0$ we obtain

$$\int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2 u_k)_i u_j \leq 0.$$

By the symmetry of a^{ij} we obtain as in [8]

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla(\phi_k u_k)|^2 \leq \Lambda^2 \|\nabla \phi_k\|^2_{L^\infty} \int_{\{\phi_k > 0\}} u_k^2.$$

The rest of the proof follows just as in [8]. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in B_1. Then*

$$\|(u - 1/2)_+\|_{L^\infty(B_{1/2})} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|u\|_{L^2 B_1},$$

where $\delta > 0$ is the constant obtained in Lemma 3.1.

Proof. We use the test function

$$u - \epsilon\phi_k^2(w - c_k)_+ \quad \text{with } w := \frac{\|u\|_{L^2}(B_1)}{\sqrt{\delta}}.$$

For ϵ small enough we still have the property

$$u - \epsilon\phi_k^2(w - c_k)_+ > 0 \text{ if and only if } u > 0,$$

so that as before we have

$$\int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2 w_k)_i u_j \leq 0.$$

By multiplying by $\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)}/\sqrt{\delta}$, we have

$$\int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2 w_k)_i w_j \leq 0.$$

Then the iteration procedure proceeds exactly as before with the same constants. □

We now move onto the second Lemma which gives a decrease in oscillation. We will use the following De Giorgi isoperimetric inequality (see [8] for a proof).

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a constant $C_n > 0$ depending only on n such that the following holds true. Consider w such that*

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla(u - 1/2)_+|^2 \leq C_0.$$

Set

$$|A| = |\{w \leq 1/2\} \cap B_1|$$
$$|C| = |\{w \geq 3/4\} \cap B_1|$$
$$|D| = |\{1/2 < w < 3/4\} \cap B_1|.$$

Then we have

$$C_0|D| \geq (|C||A|^{1-1/n})^2.$$

This next lemma is an improvement in a decrease in oscillation from above.

Lemma 3.4. *Let v be a minimizer to (1.3) in B_2 and assume $v \leq 1$ in B_1. Assume that $|B_1 \cap \{v \leq 1/2\}| \geq \mu > 0$. Then*

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} v \leq 1 - \beta$$

where β only depends on n, Λ, μ.

Proof. We would like to apply Lemma 3.1 to the rescaled functions

$$w_k := 2^k[v - (1 - 2^{-k})].$$

However, w_k are not minimizers of (1.3). We note, though, that the test function

$$u - \epsilon\phi_k(w_k - c_k)_+$$

also is such that

$$u - \epsilon\phi_k(w_k - c_k)_+ > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad u > 0.$$

Then as before we obtain

$$\int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2(w_k - c_k)_+)_i u_j \leq 0.$$

We further note that

$$\int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2(w_k - c_k)_+)_i u_j = \int_{B_1} a^{ij}(\phi_k^2(w_k - c_k)_+)_i (w_k)_j.$$

Then the identical proof with the same constants works for w_k, and so the conclusion of Lemma 3.1 holds as well for w_k. We now note a few properties of w_k.

$$\text{If } |\{u \leq 1/2\} \cap B_1| \geq \mu, \text{ then } |\{w_k \leq 1/2\} \cap B_1| \geq \mu \text{ for } k \geq 1,$$
$$|\{w_k \geq 3/4\} \cap B_1| = |\{w_{k+1} \geq 1/2\} \cap B_1|.$$

We apply Lemma 3.3 recursively as long as

$$\int_{B_1} (w_{k+1} - 1/2)_+^2 \geq \delta.$$

We have

$$|\{w_{k+1} \geq 1/2\} \cap B_1| = |\{w_k \geq 3/4\} \cap B_1| \geq \int_{B_1} (w_{k+1} - 1/2)_+^2 \geq \delta.$$

Then from lemma 3.3 there exists a constant α such that

$$|\{w_k \geq 3/4\} \cap B_1| \geq \alpha.$$

Then

$$|\{w_k \leq 1/2\} \cap B_1| \geq |\{w_{k-1} \leq 1/2\}| + \alpha \geq \mu + k\alpha.$$

This will fail for a finite number of k. Lemma 3.1 then implies that $w_{k_0+1} \leq 3/4$. Rescaling backward we obtain the result. □

4. Decrease in oscillation from below

In this section we will obtain a decrease in oscillation from below. We will prove this result for two dimensions only. We begin by showing how to bound $\|u - v\|$ in $W^{1,2}$ where v is the minimizer of (1.5) with the same boundary data as u.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega$ with u and v minimizers of* (1.3) *and* (1.5) *respectively. Then*

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij}(u - v)_i (u - v)_j \leq \Lambda |\{u = 0\}|.$$

In particular,

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla(u - v)|^2 \leq \Lambda^2 |\{u = 0\}|. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Since u is a minimizer we have $J(u) \leq J(v)$ or

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij} u_i u_j + Q\chi_{\{u>0\}} \leq \int_\Omega a^{ij} v_i v_j + Q\chi_{\{v>0\}}.$$

Since $v > 0$ everywhere we have

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij}[u_i u_j - v_i v_j] \leq \Lambda |\{u = 0\}|.$$

v is a solution to (1.6), so that

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij}(u - v)_i v_j = 0,$$

or

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij} u_i v_j = \int_\Omega a^{ij} v_i u_j = \int_\Omega a^{ij} v_i v_j.$$

Then

$$\int_\Omega a^{ij}(u-v)_i(u-v)_j = \int_\Omega a^{ij}[u_iu_j - u_iv_j - v_iu_j + v_iv_j] = \int_\Omega a^{ij}[u_iu_j - v_iv_j].$$

□

Proposition 4.2. *Let u, v be minimizers on Ω of (1.3) and (1.5) respectively with $u = v$ on $\partial\Omega$. Then $u \le v$.*

Proof. Let $w_1 = \min\{u, v\}$ and $w_2 = \max\{u, v\}$. Recall that $v > 0$ in Ω. Then

$$\begin{aligned} J(u) + D(v) + \int_\Omega Q(x)\ dx &= J(u) + J(v) \\ &= J(w_1) + J(w_2) = J(w_1) + D(w_2) + \int_\Omega Q(x)\ dx, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$J(u) + D(v) = J(w_1) + D(w_2).$$

Then necessarily w_2 is a minimizer of D, and since minimizers of D are unique we conclude that $w_2 = v$ or $u \le v$. □

We will use the following result which is specific to two dimensions.

Lemma 4.3. *Let dimension $n = 2$ and Q_1 by the unit square. Fix $\epsilon_0, \nu > 0$. Let $w \in W^{1,2}(Q_1)$ and $w = 0$ on ∂Q_1. There exists $\sigma > 0$ depending only on ϵ_0, ν such that if*

$$\int_{Q_1} |\nabla w|^2 \le \sigma,$$

then

$$Q_1 = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i$$

where $\{R_i\}$ is a finite collection of rectangles with sides parallel to the axes and with all side lengths less than ϵ_0. Furthermore,

$$|w| \le \nu \text{ on } \partial R_i,$$

for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. We label the set

$$A := x \in [-1, 1] \text{ such that } \int_{-1}^{1} w_y^2 < \nu^2.$$

For $x \in A$ and $y \in [-1, 1]$, we have

$$|w(x, y)| = \left| \int_{-1}^{y} w_y(x, t)\ dt \right| \le \left(\int_{-1}^{1} w_y^2 \right)^{1/2} \le \nu. \tag{4.2}$$

We now control $|A^c|$ by σ. From Tchebyshev's inequality we have

$$|A^c| \le \nu^{-2} \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} w_y(x, t)^2 dt dx \le \nu^{-2}\sigma$$

We choose σ so that $\sigma\nu^{-2} < \epsilon_0$. Then $|A^c| < \epsilon_0$, and in particular A^c cannot contain an interval of length greater than or equal to ϵ_0.

We now label

$$B := y \in [-1,1] \text{ such that } \int_{-1}^{1} w(t,y)_x^2 \, dt \leq \nu^2.$$

And by the same argument, B^c cannot contain an interval of length greater than ϵ_0. We now use the topology of $\mathbb{R}^2$. The points $\{(x,y) \mid x \in A \text{ or } y \in B\}$ form a grid of vertical and horizontal lines over the unit square. Notice that $\{\pm 1\} \in A \cap B$. We may choose finitely many $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ which will form a grid of finitely many rectangles each whose side lengths are less than ϵ_0. From (4.2) $|w| \leq \nu$ on the boundary of any of the rectangles. □

Lemma 4.4. *Fix dimension $n = 2$. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) over B_1. There exists a constant λ depending only on Λ such that if*

$$|B_1 \cap \{u \leq 1/2\}| \leq \lambda, \tag{4.3}$$

then

$$u \geq 1/8 \text{ on } B_{1/2}.$$

Remark 4.5. We note that the constant λ depends on an upper bound of Q whereas this is not the case for the constant δ in Lemma 3.1.

Proof. We compare u with v the minimizer of (1.5) with $u = v$ on ∂B_1. We note that if u satisfies (4.3), then necessarily $|\{u = 0\}| \leq \lambda$. This combined with (4.1) gives

$$\int_{B_1} |\nabla(u - v)|^2 \leq \Lambda\lambda.$$

For notational simplicity we will extend the values of $(v - u)$ to be zero on $Q_1 \setminus B_1$ and work over the unit square Q_1. From Lemma 4.3 we may choose λ small enough so that there exists a finite collection $\{R_i\}$ of closed rectangles such that

- $Q_1 = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i$,
- the side lengths of each R_i are less than ϵ_0
- $0 \leq v - u \leq 1/8$ on ∂R_i for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

We choose ϵ_0 as in Proposition 2.6. From Proposition 4.2, we have $v \geq u$, so that (4.3) holds for v as well. Since v is a minimizer of (1.6), from [8] we may pick λ even smaller if necessary so that $v \geq 1/4$ on $B_{3/4}$. For $R \in \{R_i\}$, if $R \subset B_{3/4}$, we have that $v - u < 1/8$ on ∂R, so that $u \geq 1/8$ on ∂R. From Proposition 2.6 we conclude that $u \geq 1/8$ in all of R. Since ϵ_0 is chosen small enough, we may select a subset $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{I}$ of rectangles, such that $B_{1/2} \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} R_j$ and $R_j \subset B_{3/4}$ for each $j \in \mathcal{J}$. It follows that $u \geq 1/8$ on $B_{1/2}$. □

We now complete the

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in Ω. Let $x_0 \in U \subset \Omega$. We rescale and translate so that $x_0 = 0$ and $B_2(x_0) \subset U_r$. This rescaling of course implies that the constant C in (1.7) will depend on the distance of U to $\partial\Omega$. We will show that there exists two constants $C, \gamma > 0$ depending only on Λ, such that for any $y \in B_{1/16}$,

$$|u(y) - u(x)| \leq C\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)}|x - y|^\gamma \tag{4.4}$$

$$u(y) \leq C\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)}. \tag{4.5}$$

By a standard scaling and covering argument (1.7) - with a new larger constant C - is proven.

From Corollary 3.2 we have that u is bounded on $B_{1/2}$ by $\|u\|_{L^2(B_1)}$. By multiplying by a constant c we have that $cu \leq 1$ on $B_{1/2}$, and cu is a minimizer of (1.3) with second term $c^2 Q \chi_{\{v>0\}}$. For notational convenience we relabel cu as just u. We now rescale $B_{1/2}$ to B_4, and choose a point x in $B_{1/2}$. By a translation we center x at the origin. We will show universal Hölder continuity around x. We first choose μ in Lemma 3.4 to be equal to λ as given in lemma 4.4. We now have the following dichotomy:

If

$$(I) \quad |B_1 \cap \{u \leq 1/2\}| \leq \lambda,$$

then $u \leq 1 - \beta$ on $B_{1/2}$. We then rescale $B_{1/2}$ to B_2 by the function

$$4^\gamma u(x/4).$$

We choose γ so that $4^\gamma(1-\beta) = 1$. We note that the rescaled $4^{\gamma-1} Q_r < Q \leq \Lambda$. We then repeat the procedure if (I) continues to hold. If (I) holds for all iterations, then necessarily $u(0) = 0$ and we obtain that

$$u(y) \leq C|y|^\gamma$$

with $\gamma_1 = \ln(1/(1-\beta))/\ln 4$.

If at some point (I) does not hold then

$$(II) \quad |\{B_1 \cap \{u \leq 1/2\}| > \lambda,$$

and then from Lemma 4.4, $u \geq 1/8$ on $B_{1/2}$, and so u is a minimizer of (1.5). To proceed with the iteration and oscillation we use the original De Giorgi lemmas. These lemmas applied to minimizers of (1.5) have the same constants δ, β, C since our estimates were uniform for $\sup Q \leq \Lambda$. The iteration then proceeds as shown in [8]. Then (4.4) is shown and the Theorem is proven. □

5. Nondegeneracy

As stated in the Introduction, the arguments used to prove the results in this section do not depend on dimension. However, the results that rely on Theorem 1.1 are stated only for dimension $n = 2$ since Theorem 1.1 was only proven for dimension $n = 2$. As a few results in this section rely on compactness methods, we will need the following.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\{u_k\}$ be a sequence of minimizers of (1.3) in B_1 with coefficients a_k^{ij} satisfying (1.4) and $\sup Q_k \leq \Lambda$ for fixed Λ. Assume also*

$$\sup \|u_k\|_{W^{1,2}(B_1)} < \infty.$$

Then there exists a subsequence - relabeled $\{u_k\}$ - and a limit function u_0 such that u_0 is a minimizer of (1.3) with limits a_0^{ij} and Q_0. Furthermore,

$$u_k \rightharpoonup u_0 \text{ in } W^{1,2} \tag{5.1}$$

$$u_k \to u_0 \text{ in } C^{0,\alpha}(B_r) \text{ for every } r < 1, \tag{5.2}$$

for every $\alpha < \gamma$ for γ given as in the statement of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. The weak convergence as stated in (5.1) is immediate. The Hölder convergence is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1. The fact that u_0 is a minimizer of (1.3) is also standard and straightforward. □

We now show a Lipschitz bound around any free boundary point.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We will use a compactness method and obtain a contradiction. The idea is to obtain a sequence of minimizers where $\sup Q \to 0$, but in the limit we obtain a nonnegative solution to (1.6) that is not identically zero but evaluates zero at the origin. This is a contradiction. This general idea was used in [3], and we will follow the outline given therein. We define

$$S_r(u,x) := \sup_{B_r(x)} u.$$

Suppose by way of contradiction that (1.8) is not true. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_k\}$ of minimizers of (1.3) and points $x_k \in B_{1/2}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1) \quad a_k^{ij} \text{ satisfies (1.4)}\\
&(2) \quad \int_{B_1} |\nabla u_k|^2 \leq 1\\
&(3) \quad \lambda_k \leq 1\\
&(4) \quad \frac{S_{r_k}(u,x_k)}{r_k} = C_k \to \infty\\
&(5) \quad S_{2r_k}(u_k,x_k) \leq 2S_{r_k}(u_k,x_k).
\end{aligned}$$

We define

$$w_k(x) := \frac{u(r_k x + x_k)}{S_{r_k}(u_k,x_k)},$$

and note that w_k is a minimizer in B_2 of the functional

$$\int_{B_2} b_k^{ij}(w)_i(w)_j + \frac{r_k}{S_{r_k}(u,x_k)} Q_{r_k}\chi_{\{w>0\}},$$

where b_k^{ij} are the rescaled coefficients that also satisfy (1.4) and Q_{r_k} are the rescaled terms of Q_k. It follows from the Proposition 5.1, that there exists w_0 with $w_k \to w_0$ in $C^{0,\alpha}$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}$ and w_0 is a minimizer of (1.5) in B_2. Furthermore, from (5) we have that $\sup_{\partial B_1} w_0 = 1$. But $w_0(0) = 0$ from the Hölder convergence. This violates the maximum principle. □

The next few steps are aimed at proving the nondegeneracy. In order to prove the nondegeneracy we will also assume $\inf Q \geq \Lambda^{-1}$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in B_r and assume $\inf Q \geq \Lambda^{-1}$. Fix $0 < c_0 < |B_1|$. There exists ϵ_0 depending on Λ, n such that if $u \leq r\epsilon_0$ on ∂B_r, then*

$$|\{u = 0\} \cap B_r| > rc_0.$$

Proof. By rescaling it suffices to prove the Proposition for $r = 1$. We consider v_ϵ to be the maximum solution (given by Corollary 2.2) with constant boundary data ϵ. It suffices to prove the Proposition for v_ϵ since $u \leq v_\epsilon$ by Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2. We now also consider w_ϵ to be the minimizer with constant boundary data ϵ and with $a^{ij} = \delta_{ij}$. Then

$$J(v_\epsilon) \leq J(w_\epsilon) \leq \Lambda \int_{B_1} |\nabla w_\epsilon|^2 + \chi_{\{w_\epsilon > 0\}}.$$

Using symmetric test functions it is clear that

$$\Lambda \int_{B_1} |\nabla w_\epsilon|^2 + \chi_{\{w_\epsilon > 0\}} \to 0 \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0.$$

Then there exists ϵ_0 such that

$$\Lambda^{-1}|\{v_\epsilon > 0\}| \leq J(v_\epsilon) \leq (|B_1| - c_0),$$

so that $|\{v_\epsilon = 0\} \cap B_1| > c_0$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in Ω and assume $\inf Q \geq \Lambda^{-1}$. Let $x_0 \in \{u > 0\}$. There exists a universal constant C depending on n, Λ such that if $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega) \geq \text{dist}(x_0, \{u = 0\})$, then*

$$u(x_0) > C\text{dist}(x_0, \{u = 0\}).$$

Proof. By rescaling we may assume that $\text{dist}(x_0, \{u = 0\}) = 1$. Then $B_1(x_0) \subset \{u > 0\}$. We must show that $u(x_0)$ is univerally bounded from below. From the Harnack inequality we have that

$$u(x_0) > c_{n,\Lambda} \sup_{B_{1/2}(x_0)} u,$$

where $c_{n,\Lambda}$ is a constant depending only on dimension n and Λ. Since $u > 0$ in $B_{1/2}$, we have from Proposition 5.2 that

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}(x_0)} u > \frac{\epsilon_0}{2},$$

where ϵ_0 is given as in Proposition 5.2. Combining the above two inequalities shows that $u(x_0)$ is univerally bounded from below and completes the proof. □

Lemma 5.3 gives a nondegeneracy result, but a different nondegeneracy result is generally needed in the study of free boundary problems. We now prove the more general Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We follow an argument to prove nondegeneracy that was presented in [7]. This argument is given in two steps.

First Step. Let u be a minimizer of (1.3) in B_2 such that

(1) $0 \in \partial\{u > 0\}$
(2) $B_1(e_1, 0) \subset \{u > 0\}$
(3) $u(\epsilon_1) = \tau > 0$.

From Lemma 5.3, τ is universally bounded away from zero. We claim the existence of $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{B_2(0)} u \geq (1 + \kappa)\tau.$$

Suppose this claim is not true. Then there exists a sequence $\{u_k\}$ of minimizers to (1.3) in B_2 such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{B_2} u_k = \tau.$$

From Proposition 5.1 $u_k \to u_0$ in $C^{0,\alpha}(\rho)$ for $\rho < 2$. Furthermore, $u_0 > 0$ in $B_1(e_1, 0)$ and hence a solution in B_1. Now $u_0(e_1, 0) = \tau$ which is the sup of u_0, so by the maximum principle, $u_0 \equiv \tau$ in $B_1(e_1, 0)$. However, $u_0(0) = 0$ and u_0 is continuous, so we have arrived at the contradiction and the claim is proven.

Second Step. By translation we assume that the free boundary point $x_0 = 0$ the origin. We construct inductively a sequence of points x_k such that

- $u(x_{k+1}) > (1+\eta)u(x_k)$
- if $r_k :=\text{dist}(x_k, \{u = 0\})$ and $\tilde{x}_k$ is a free boundary point realising the distance, we have $x_{k+1} \in B_{2r_k}(\tilde{x}_k)$. This is allowed from a resclaing in the claim of Step 1.

We then have

$$|x_{k+1} - x_k| \leq (2+1)r_k.$$

We end the induction the first time x_k leaves $B_1(0)$. This is possible since $u(x_k)$ grows geometrically and by Theorem 1.2 $u(x_k)$ is controlled by $|x_k|$. Let k_0 be the first time x_k leaves $B_1(0)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
u(x_{k_0+1}) &= \sum_{k \leq k_0} (u(x_{k+1}) - u(x_k)) \\
&\geq \eta \sum_{k \leq k_0} u(x_k) \\
&\geq C_1 \eta \sum_{k \leq k_0} \text{dist}(x_k, \{u = 0\}) \quad \text{by nondegeneracy} \\
&\geq C_2 \eta \sum_{k \leq k_0} |x_{k+1} - x_k| \\
&\geq C_2 \eta |x_{k_0}| \geq C_2 \eta
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\sup_{B_3} u \geq C_2 \eta.$$

We have proven the result for $r = 3$. Rescaling gives the result for all r. □

References

1. Mark Allen, Luis Caffarelli, and Alexis Vasseur, *Porous medium flow with both a fractional potential pressure and fractional time derivative*, preprint available on arxiv.org, 2016.
2. Mark Allen and Héctor Chang Lara, *Free boundaries on two-dimensional cones*, J. Geom. Anal. **25** (2015), no. 3, 1547–1575. MR 3358064
3. Mark Allen, Erik Lindgren, and Arshak Petrosyan, *The two-phase fractional obstacle problem*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **47** (2015), no. 3, 1879–1905. MR 3348118
4. H. W. Alt and L. A. Caffarelli, *Existence and regularity for a minimum problem with free boundary*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **325** (1981), 105–144. MR 618549
5. Luis Caffarelli and Sandro Salsa, *A geometric approach to free boundary problems*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 68, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. MR 2145284
6. Luis Caffarelli, Fernando Soria, and Juan Luis Vázquez, *Regularity of solutions of the fractional porous medium flow*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **15** (2013), no. 5, 1701–1746. MR 3082241
7. Luis A. Caffarelli, Jean-Michel Roquejoffre, and Yannick Sire, *Variational problems for free boundaries for the fractional Laplacian*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **12** (2010), no. 5, 1151–1179. MR 2677613
8. Luis A. Caffarelli and Alexis F. Vasseur, *The De Giorgi method for regularity of solutions of elliptic equations and its applications to fluid dynamics*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **3** (2010), no. 3, 409–427. MR 2660718 (2011g:35053)
9. Daniela De Silva, Fausto Ferrari, and Sandro Salsa, *Perron's solutions for two-phase free boundary problems with distributed sources*, Nonlinear Anal. **121** (2015), 382–402. MR 3348930

10. Daniela De Silva and Ovidiu Savin, *Minimizers of convex functionals arising in random surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **151** (2010), no. 3, 487–532. MR 2605868
11. Fausto Ferrari and Sandro Salsa, *Regularity of the free boundary in two-phase problems for linear elliptic operators*, Adv. Math. **214** (2007), no. 1, 288–322. MR 2348032
12. Mariano Giaquinta, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations and nonlinear elliptic systems*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 105, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983. MR 717034
13. Eduardo V. Teixeira, *A variational treatment for general elliptic equations of the flame propagation type: regularity of the free boundary*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **25** (2008), no. 4, 633–658. MR 2436786

Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712
E-mail address: mallen@math.utexas.edu